

DDDS GAC CMS Medicaid Residential Work Group Transcription
May 21, 2015 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Members present: Melinda South, Victor Schaffner, Laura Waterland, Tim Brooks, Terry Olson, Lisa Green, Eddi Ashby, Libby Cusack, and Pat Jordan. **Missing:** Kathie Cherry, Jamie Doane, Kyle Hodges, Gary Mears, Bill Monaghan, and Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz

Non-members present: Lisa Elias, Michael Harris, Terry Macy, and Daniese McMullin-Powell

"This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings."

Female: Short quite a few people today, if you would like to have a seat at the table. Denise, if you would like to move in a little bit more, they have a tough time hearing you on the recording. Yeah.

[Background noise]

Are we were ready?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Female: All right. Let's get started. Have a lot to cover tonight, or today.

[Background noise]

Ah, before we get started I heard from Kyle, Bill, Gary, and Cathy that they are not going to be able to join us today. Let's go around the table for introductions. Libby Cusack.

Male: Terry Olson.

Female: (Indiscernible).

Female: Lisa (Indiscernible).

Female: Denise (Indiscernible).

Male: Tim Brooks.

Male: Victor (Indiscernible).

Female: Eddie Ashby.

Female: Pat Jordan.

Female: Melinda South.

Female: Lisa Green.

Female: Okay. Um, meeting ground rules just quickly. The meetings are being recorded, the recording is right here. So announce your name when you speak, and please speak up. One person talks at a time and be respectful when someone is speaking. Please limit phone calls during the meeting. Meetings will start and end on time. Let's try to stay on the agenda, and everyone is asked to please do the homework before the meetings. And guests may participate in the meetings but only committee members may vote. Next on the agenda is -- ah, if, are there any, does anyone have changes or connections to the meeting transcript from last week? Would you like to announce yourself for the recording?

Male: Hi. Terry Macy. Director of community services.

Female: Thank you, all right -- ah -- hmm? Okay. Um, as part of the transcript review, I would like to address the conversation from last week. Our May 14th meeting that started with Bill Monaghan questioning the role of the meeting cochair. On page eight of the transcript. Bill mentions twice that he was voted in as cochair. Voted in as the cochair role. I believe the meeting transcripter took a few liberties in defining who was speaking during that conversation -- and neither time do I believe that Bill or

myself, for that matter were voted in as chair and cochairs. I believe I volunteered for the role after a long silence on the subject and everyone was relieved and we moved on. I believe that Bill was the only self-advocate in our group and accepted the cochair self-advocate role. So without hearing the recording from the meeting, I can't say who in particular agreed with Bill, that he was voted in as cochair, but I am very sure that it was not me who said, right during that conversation has noted on page eight. My name should be removed from that comment and replaced with unknown female as with other similar comments. Um -- and as we agree to previously, I think with this being documented in our transcript, that, my comments will be dually noted for the corrections from last week.

Male: Ah, this is Tim. Libby you are absolutely correct. I was the one who started the conversation about chair and cochair and I was getting very concerned during that depth of silence that, and I was very thankful when you came forward and agreed to do it. Bill never said anything. I turned to Bill and, ah, he then said he was the only self-advocate in the room and I said, yeah. And he said, well, I guess I, cochair. And he was very reluctant at the time. So I think -- I think you're correct in how it all approved.

Female: Okay. And I wasn't looking for discussion. I just wanted to correct the point that I was noted as saying that I agreed with what he said, and I did not say that.

As far as the agenda goes, I sent out a copy of Kyle Hodges' e-mail, I would like to go through that e-mail after we review the draft Delaware document that was sent out if that is okay with everyone. And I think, um, before we go into that draft document, if it is okay with everyone, I think it might be helpful, Eddie, if you were prepared to speak on the look behind process and who is going to participate in that process. I think that might be helpful to keep in mind as we go through the Delaware assessment.

Female: Okay. DDDS is not completely finalized that process as of yet. As of now, it is a throughout that the OQI. The DDDS OQI team would be doing the look behind with someone possibly from the GAC.

Female: I'm sorry. What is OQI?

Male: (Indiscernible).

Female: (Indiscernible).

Female: Office of quality insurance.

Male: Quality insurance?

Female: Quality assurance, OQI.

Male: Yeah.

Female: Insurance?

Female: No, and -- inquiry?

Female: They did change it to OQI.

Female: I'll get the exact for you.

Female: Okay.

Male: (Speaker off microphone).

Female: Someone from the, I'll start again. DDDS is not completely finalized that process as of yet. As of now, it is they thought that OQI, which the quality insurance team would be doing the look behind with someone possibly from the GAC being part of the look behind team. It will be the same for the shared living providers.

Female: This is Melinda speaking. It is the office of quality improvement.

Male: Ah, there you go.

Female: Thank you. And this is Libby, I believe Fran said previously, initially 20% of the responses would be reviewed and then 100% will be reviewed over the course of, I forget what time frame, a year or something like that. Is that still accurate.

Male: It is the common protocol. Terry.

Female: Thank you.

Male: Yep.

Male: I'm sorry. What is the common protocol?

Male: Sampling.

Female: A 20% sampling.

Male: Well --

Male: That's what most other states are doing.

Male: Not all states though.

Female: Okay. That's Victor speaking.

Male: And the 100% would be over what period of time?

Female: I'll get clarification on that, I don't know exactly.

Female: Yeah. I believe Fran mentioned over a year previously, but -- hello?

Male: How are you?

Female: Good.

Male: (Speaker off microphone) this is open for -- right?

Female: Yes. It is. If you can announce yourself for the recording, please.

Male: My name is Michael Harris. I'm just (Indiscernible).

Female: Michael Harris.

Male: Yes.

Female: Thank you.

Male: (Indiscernible).

Female: Did everyone sign the sign-in sheet, if you can pass that around, thank you.

Okay. So the draft Delaware assessment. Um, a couple of my caveats before we get into this. Um, I added the front page, there was some samples of questions, we'll go through that page. That was just some questions that I thought I could add in, we can go through that, at delete, whatever we want to do.

Male: The front page.

Female: The first page, page one of the draft.

Male: Okay.

Female: So I think we can go through that, after we go through the rest of the document. And as you probably noticed, um, I kind of grouped them, many of the questions together. Michael, if you would like to pull your chair up to the table. We're missing quite a few people today.

Female: He wants to come down here, we can share the (Indiscernible), if he wants.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Share the what?

Female: Document.

Female: I'll get him a copy.

Female: Two, three.

Female: Thanks.

Male: Ah, Libby, this is Tim. Before we start on the document, we have the TAC meeting on Tuesday and during that time Jean Galvan indicated she had gotten some preliminary information from CMS on this whole project. And she indicated that the timeline we're currently working with, ah, might get shortened because CMS may think we're taking too much time. Now, I don't think that will impact us on the June 15th deadline for us, but it may impact the amount of time of the providers have to do the actual self-assessment. When I looked over this, this to the other day, ah, I, I mean one thing I was struck by was its very long. And I'm little worried about providers having enough time to get a 20% sample on something like this.

So I think, I think as a group we need to think about ways we can reduce some of the questions. Okay.

Female: Providers have to do 100%, don't we. The look behind is 20%.

Male: Okay.

Female: That's correct.

Male: This is Tim, now --

[Laughter]

Thank you.

Female: Okay. That was Lisa. If you can please state your name, everybody. The transcript is important to have as accurate as possible.

Um, okay. So back to the assessment, we're going to start on page two. As I was mentioning before, I tried to group some of the questions under, under categories if that offends anyone, or if anyone wants to change that, I think we can talk about that. It just seemed to make sense that some of these overall topics kind of were very similar. So I combined some of the questions under certain topics like privacy, um, includes -- a few of the basic element review tool, um, subjects, um, so as we go through that, if you want to change any of that just speak up.

Male: This is Terry. In keeping with what Tim as pointed out, and I agree, are we going to make a concerted effort to try to eliminate redundancies and group things together in ways that make sense? So that is something we can talk about today.

Female: Yes. Absolutely. This is Libby. I think we should talk about that.

Male: Okay.

Female: As I went through the document and tried to pullout the questions that we agreed to include, I mean there were some duplicates that were very obvious. And I put everything in there, I didn't try to change anything.

Male: Okay.

Female: So when we see duplicates we'll delete one or the other?

Male: This is Victor, in addition, to eliminating some redundancies and so on, are we also going to in this session to refine the questions to get them word and letter perfect. Or should we be doing that later on?

Female: This is Melinda, my suggestion would be if we can add suggestions of how we'd like to tweak and we can agree. But if it's going to take a long period of time maybe we parking lot it.

Male: I have a feeling if we are to do that it will take an awfully long time. I mean, just speaking for myself, I would think that most everyone at this table has done a lot of this as well. There are very few questions as they were written that I would think are ready to go?

Female: I agree.

Male: So I think it would be a virtual impossibility depending on what the objective is today, to get through the entire document if you're going to be wordsmithing each question.

Male: This is Terry.

Male: Which at some point we need to do?

Male: The question that occurs to me, maybe we should start that process now and just lower or reduce the scope of what we plan to cover today, but, um, do it once so that we're close to a finished product when we're done?

Female: Okay. This is Libby. If you take a look at the questions that are marked as exploratory questions, basically exploratory questions those came from the CMS exploratory questions document, and many of the other states have used those questions as written. So -- I mean, we can reword many of these as we have time, but I think I would agree with several of you, let's try to get through this department today. If you have suggestion for changing the wording speak up. If you would like to say, I think the wording isn't very good, then we will mark that and continue on and get back to that in another meeting.

Male: But Libby to be clear, if there are ideas to make the, you know, a question, or a number of questions exactly right to the word, you're inviting us to do that today.

Female: If you have a suggestion or how to reword it written down and ready to go. Yes. This is Libby. I would agree to that.

All right. Anything else before we get started? Um, I just had one other thought, um, that's when we go back to the first page we're going to have instructions on how to complete this as well. Just to keep that in mind as we go through.

All right. Page two, number one privacy exploratory questions, 11 -- does anyone have any?

Male: I do.

Female: Discussion on that? Go.

Male: The first question, I think it is -- better if it is worded do all individuals.

Female: This is Libby. Victor I did try to go through and make some of these changes, but it was taking a lot of time. So I did the first go through, you will notice I missed a lot of the individual to all individuals.

Male: I appreciate that, but at some point.

Female: Right. Right.

Male: Do the due diligence.

Female: Correct. Yeah.

Male: The other suggestion I have, this is Terry, before technology we can consider added needed communication. And I don't know if that gets too wordy or not.

Female: You say look down to Tennessee 24, that duplicates this, but it actually words it better.

Female: I agree, this is Lisa?

Female: I agree, I had the same note.

Male: Let's go with that, then.

Male: I like that, too.

Male: I would just put in all are individuals -- Tennessee.

Female: This Laura, it is consistent all of the way through if we're going to do that, right? Another one of those tedious, horrible tasks.

Female: All right. I'll make sure I change it to all individuals.

All right. So we're scratching exploratory question 11 bullet one and using Tennessee 24. Changing it to all are individuals. Correct?

Female: Yeah.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Second bullet.

Male: I don't see the necessity of the second bullet given what is covered in the first bullet.

Female: I think Tennessee 24 encompasses all of this.

Female: Because it uses the word private. You're trying to capture there is privacy in use, not just a communal thing.

Female: Okay. Do we all agree that bullet two is deleted.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Anybody other thoughts. Delete bullet two. Bullet three?

Male: Just insert all, do all individuals.

Male: This is Terry, I was just wondering if that's going to be an unnecessary burden for those individuals who have no interest in, in -- um.

Female: (Indiscernible).

Male: Telephones or Internets. It is just a thought. One of things we could do would be to change it to add at the end for each individual who desires or could benefit from this access. I mean some people are

nonverbal.

Female: Absolutely, there have a lot of folks that don't have telephones?

Female: Are you talking about bullet number three. They're asking if the room has it, not if the person is using it.

Male: Again, the point I'm making is it could represent an unnecessary expense for providers.

Female: Right.

Male: Terry Macy. I, I don't think that -- I would make that big of deal, to tell you the truth.

Female: Right.

Male: It is just asking is it available. You don't have to install it.

Male: Okay.

Female: And this is Libby. And I, maybe we should clarify rooms. I mean is it available in the house? Is it available or the bathroom.

Male: Yeah. I would change this to bedrooms, too. This is Terry.

Female: I mean, I think Tennessee 24 encompasses it all. I mean they have seven questions for every single.

Male: I do, too.

Female: For every single exploratory questions, but that is up to you, folks.

Female: This is Libby. It is up to all of us.

Female: Thanks, Libby.

Female: You're welcome. All right. So the third bullet?

Male: This is Tim, I don't think we need it. I agree with Lisa.

Female: Victor.

Please press any key to remain in conference.

Male: Who is that?

Female: Kimberly. If she is not in soon we'll turn it off. All right. Does anyone want to keep that bullet number three and discuss it anymore or okay.

Female: I hate to be --

Female: Go ahead.

Female: I'm looking at 24, which I do like, are you permitted to have a private cell phone, computer, or personal communication device or access to a telephone. The only thing I'm concerned about deleting bullet three is that there is just permitting someone to have one and then having it actually be something that is provided, you know, its -- if you have the money and the ability to set one up then yes. You can have one, or somewhat incumbent upon the provider to provide the Jack or the Wi-Fi or whatever if the person wants it. It is a point of clarification. Because permitting someone to have something and then actually making it available are two different things.

Male: This is Victor. I agree with Laura.

Female: Okay. Victor and Laura, can you suggest an update to that bullet three?

Female: If you don't like, to kind of address Terry's point. This is Laura. Are, are, are jacks or Internet, is it available upon request or --

Male: For each individual who desires this access?

Female: Or something along those lines.

Male: I'm okay with that.

Female: For each individual -

Male: Who desires this access.

Female: Yeah.

Female: So we're keeping bullet three, to do individuals --

Female: Desiring a telephone Jack or Internet access in their room, it is hard to phrase it as do individual's question, because it doesn't really.

Male: I think you can have at the end, each individual who desires this access?

Female: Are we leaving in rooms, though.

Male: Bedrooms, I would say.

Female: Bedrooms.

Male: And then it would be singular individual. This is Terry.

Female: All right. So we're keeping bullet three. Moving on exploratory question 16.

Male: This is Terry Olson. I guess I should be clear here. Is personal care assistance would be my suggestion, you know, I don't think that kind of implies the kind of personal things that should be private.

Female: I would agree with that.

Male: This is Victor, I would suggest to finish off that sentence, when needed by an individual. Otherwise who is to say, who is to say, um, whether it is needed or not.

Female: Is personal care assistant and provided as appropriate when needed by an individual?

Male: Right.

Female: Everybody okay with that?

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: All right. Next one, 20, exploratory question, 20, first bullet. Is personal health information about individuals kept private.

Male: This is Terry. I thought Connecticut 26, um, was a better statement.

Female: Degrees.

Male: Tennessee 26.

Male: Connecticut. Connecticut 26. I.

Female: I agree, this is Libby.

Male: This is Tim, I'm fine with that.

Male: I would tweak it, are all individuals personal health information, etc.

Female: Okay. So we're keeping Connecticut 26 with all individuals and deleting exploratory question 20, the first bullet. Second bullet is schedules of individuals for PTOP medications restricted.

Male: I think that redundant, this is Terry.

Female: I agree.

Female: Anybody opposed to deleting that second bullet? Was that a hmm?]

Female: You could put all of their personal information in there, then yeah it does. It is sort of stressing the point what they are getting it, to be specific.

Male: I saw those at examples.

Female: Yeah. You could add such as if you wanted to modify 26, but I think it does capture it.

Male: This is Terry. I think anybody is trying to hit the personal health information.

Female: We are not new at this ballgame as providers.

Male: This is not your first rodeo?

Female: No. This isn't my first rodeo?

[Laughter]

Female: However, we have.

Female: On this committee.

Female: We have -- providers answering these questions as well, they might not be as well-versed as some others.

Male: Good point.

Female: Oh, yeah.

Female: Yeah.

Female: So Connecticut 20, are all individuals personal health information and other personal information, such as PTOP, medications, restricted, etc., kept private.

Male: Yeah.

Female: And deleting exploratory question bullet two.

Female: Yeah.

Female: Anybody opposed? All right. Next is exploratory question, three. Are cameras present in the setting. If we look at Tennessee 26 --

Male: Better.

Female: I agree. Does anyone oppose deleting exploratory question three?

Female: No.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Victor? Laura? Deleting exploratory question three? And keeping Tennessee 26. Anything, any changes for Tennessee 26? Okay. Moving on, exploratory question two A, do all individuals have the opportunity to close and lock the bedroom door, bathroom door, A, B, and C, any comments.

Male: This is Terry. I would just change the to their.

Female: Their bedroom, their bathroom.

Male: Right.

Female: Okay.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Are we okay to keep all three?

Female: Yeah.

Male: Um, this is Victor. If you look down to the bottom of the page, Hawaii privacy six and the first bit of it, do all individuals have a key to the home. Um, I was wondering if that belongs more with the group that we're discussing here. Exploratory question two.

Female: This is Laura, I think they are relating, they are obviously all related to privacy, but they are different concepts. Actually getting in the house versus having privacy in the bathroom, versus having privacy in the bedroom.

Female: These are each, once these are reformatted. I'm thinking out the first two comments, because we don't need that anymore. These are all going to be questions at the same level.

Male: Okay.

Female: If that's okay.

Male: Okay.

Female: So we're keeping exploratory question two, A, B, and C. Exploratory question three, do staff, any questions, comments on that one.

Male: This is Terry. Um, I would qualify living area by putting private before that and then taking out privacy. Um, and then at the end, I would suggest ask or documented as necessary in the person-centered plan of care.

Female: Any comments on that.

Male: This is Tim, I agree with that. I think that is -- (Indiscernible).

Female: Would you reiterate that?

Male: At the end just at and other documented as necessary in the person-centered plan of care.

Female: Referring to the limited circumstances. That's what you're talking about.

Male: Yeah. There are some circumstances that a perm may not agree to it, but it might be necessary for their safety, for example.

Female: Okay. So we have does staff only use a key to enter a private living area under limited

circumstances agreed upon with all individuals and/or documented as necessary in the person-centered plan of care.

Male: This is Tim, I don't think all individuals works in that case. Because we're talking about the individual and the individual plan.

Male: Maybe each individual.

Male: That would work.

Male: That's inclusive as well, I think, Victor.

Male: I think so.

Female: So with those changes we're okay to keep three D?

Female: Yes.

Female: Hawaii six.

Male: This is Terry again, to avoid a lot of discarded keys I suggest are there --

Female: I agree, what are you looking for?

Male: Are all individuals offered an opportunity to have a key to the home.

Female: If they say they --

Male: Well, not if they so desire. I mean, you offer them and then learn whether they desire it or not.

Female: Terry, can you say that again?

Male: Are all individuals offered the opportunity to have a key to the home.

Female: There's a wide scope of disabilities out there.

Male: Sure.

Female: If I offered some of my people a key, they wouldn't know what I was talking about.

Male: I had some individuals swallow them.

[Laughter]

Male: That is true.

Female: And it is always not even a key anymore. It is, a thumbprint. Swipe card. Code. This is Libby. So I don't know if we want to change key to access device or something like that.

Male: Sure.

Male: Key/access device perhaps.

Male: But what's the question? And currently? Offered or have --

Female: Offered. Okay. The question is, are all individual offered the opportunity to have a key/access device to the home.

Male: I think that's fine and to Terry and Lisa's concern about that some people might use it to stab or to swallow and so on, that's part of the explanation the answer is no.

Male: Yep, that gets back to the person centered plan of care.

Female: Okay. So we're leaving.

Female: Terry, when you say back to the person-centered planning, am I going to have to and every single one of my residents that want a key. And there are nonverbal residents that don't understand, so it will have to go in the person-centered plan.

Male: If they don't understand, then --

Female: But I'm saying we need to be careful of everything we're having to put in this person-centered plan and not make this so cumbersome.

Male: This is Terry. I was responding to Victor's question. Where somebody has (Indiscernible) and swallows keys and other things, you would certainly identify that with in a person-centered plan of care. I agree with Lisa, there has to be a, you know, balance of reasonableness in this whole process. So hopefully that can be an assumption.

Male: Yeah. Terry Macy, I don't know if it has to go to the level. I know you're making a good point

referring back to the person. I don't know if we need to clutter up.

Female: We don't, you're right .

Male: The person care plan on each, with the level of detail.

Female: But we need to know what the look back people are going to be looking for. You know what I mean.

Male: Oh, I do, I do. I think they will be more reasonable then you may fear.

Female: Good.

Female: Back to Hawaii six. Are we deleting the two that are there. We added a new one, what are we doing with the two there?

Male: I don't think --

Male: Second one is unnecessary.

Female: So we're deleting those two and replacing it what we came up with.

Male: Can you repeat the question that we came up with again, please.

Female: Are all individuals offered the opportunity to have a key/access device to the home?

Male: Terry Macy again, that says home, I think you're looking at framing it to room.

Female: Right.

Female: No. I think they were looking at home.

Male: Yeah.

Male: They were. Okay. Because I thought they changed the wording.

Female: I believe it is exploratory question home.

Male: Exploratory question home or they bedroom door. So which are we talking about?

Female: The home.

Male: Okay. It is an awful lot of keys.

Male: Both separately, actually.

Male: Yeah.

Female: This is Libby, can we say home and private areas?

Male: I think they have to be separate questions, though.

Male: This is Terry. You get into life safety things, too, you don't want locks on bedroom doors that precludes a person from existing in a fire on emergencies, it is general your twist door that opens with a single.

Female: Okay. This is Libby.

Male: Required by code.

Female: Above we addressed the bedroom doors and bathroom doors.

Male: Yeah. I think between what we have already done we're okay. This is Terry.

Female: All right. Moving on to page three. Exploratory question 16.

Male: This is Terry, I would add in the home after communication, but --

Male: Ah.

Male: Isn't that what we're measuring. What happens in the home. I don't know.

Male: Terry Macy.

Male: Control that outside of the home.

Male: Well, the thing about the other part of the final rule is -- communication so it is not just limited to the house.

Male: This is Tim, we just moved from privacy issues to dignity and respect. Would that be beyond the home.

Male: Right.

Female: This is Denise, in our group yesterday -- nonresidential services, there were questioning people (

Indiscernible) places without the communication device, because it was left.

Female: I'm sorry. This is Melinda, can you speak up just a little bit more.

Female: I'm sorry.

Male: She got a fan above her head.

Female: I'm in the other group, the nonresidential one, and they were talking yesterday about sometimes people show up at work or at the shop or at the day hab without their communication device because it is left at home. So I think it is important that they have it any time that they need it. Because I don't know how to take care of that but to make sure that it's with them.

Female: Denise, you're suggesting that we leave this question as is. Not to limit it to the home.

Female: Yes.

Female: Okay. So exploratory question 16, leave as is.

Male: Um --

Female: I like it. This is Melinda.

Male: Um, this is Victor. Where it says, um conducting language or manner, where we get assistive technology, that the individual understands, um -- um, ability, I would say language and manner, it's -- it's -- I think it is more inclusive that way, and I would say that each individual understands.

Male: This is Terry, I agree.

Female: All right. So Victor is suggesting is informal written and/or oral communication conducted in a language and manner including assistive technology that each individual understands.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Is anybody opposed to that. All right. 20?

Male: Are all individuals.

Female: Comma is no good. Right? I'm just saying.

Male: Right.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: So we're keeping exploratory question 20, bullet one and two, with all individuals? Any other --

Male: Yes. Do we need the second, this is Tim, do we need the second butting. Would grooming cover everything?

Male: This is Terry. I think nails are so often overlooked that I would recommend it as a separate item. Toenails in particular.

Male: This is Tim, I'm just thinking of the length of this thing.

Male: I know.

Female: This is Libby, and I think Tim once we get rid of all of the extra information in here, I think it's going to.

Female: It is going to fill beautifully, Tim.

Female: It is going to be the best darn state assessment out there.

[Laughter]

Male: This is Tim, I'll take your word for it.

Female: This is Lisa, we're going to fill it on out on end and see (Indiscernible).

[Low audio]

[Laughter]

Very distressed.

Female: All right. So we're keeping both bullets under 20. Exploratory question and including all. Exploratory question 21.

Female: It is fine.

Male: With all.

Female: All for everything.

Female: Exploratory question as with all. Exploratory question 22.

Female: Yell. All.

Male: This is Terry, that first one really seems odd to me, but I guess.

Female: Well, I think it is important, this is Lisa?

Male: That they are interacted with.

Female: Yeah. They are interacting with, with the staff and socialization going on, opposed to just being in a bedroom doing nothing. It might be able to be -- worded differently, but I think.

Male: I just wonder if it shouldn't we do staff greet and chat with individuals.

Male: This is Victor, that's what I was thinking as well, Terry.

Female: Which is bullet number two, I guess.

Male: Yeah. I think that.

Male: I can live with it, either way.

Male: That's why, at least I had taken out the first bullet, because I think the second bullet is, is -- is far more important.

Male: I agree.

Female: Does anybody oppose to deleting the first bullet?

Female: No.

Female: All right. And the second bullet as is, or any changes.

Male: I would include with all individuals.

Female: Got it. Any other changes to bullet two? We'll move on. Bullet three.

Male: I like it.

Male: Hmm. I would just tweak it with any and all individuals and then make the next individual plural as well.

Female: Ah. Refrain from talking to other staff about any and all individuals?

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: And any all individuals as if the individual with the S --

Male: Individuals in parentheses is.

Female: Is present?

Female: Just drop the and in individuals, and make the clearer.

Male: Where?

Female: Well, just drop and put individuals.

Male: How about a compromise, any individuals and then you have it covered both ways without any and all.

Female: Does staff refrain from talking to other staff about any individuals as if the individuals was, were --

Male: Were --

Female: We're not present.

Male: I'm okay with that.

Female: I'm sorry. What did I just read? Are we changing the and to any.

Male: Yeah. I think so.

Female: And then change.

Female: The S and the was were.

Male: This is Tim, this remains me of many faculty meetings at the University of Delaware.

Female: It is a compliment.

Male: It is not a happy experience.

Male: My education was different.

Female: This is Libby. This just doesn't sound right to me. Do staff or does staff?

Male: Ah, maybe do.

Male: It is a running debate.

Male: Right.

Please press any key to remain in conference --

Female: Any preference. Who is the expert?

Male: I prefer does. The people that I work with that prefer do.

Female: I prefer do, but I can do does, I just want to be consistent between the three. So I will change it to does staff converse, does not make sense?

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Okay. All right. We're on the last bullet under exploratory question 22.

Female: This is Lisa, our visitor had a good point, but he didn't want to bring it up. For number 22, the three bullet about staff refraining to talking about other staff about an individual, we're thinking of it as a negative way, but he is thinking of a positive way, you might be talking and bragging about them, look at what a great job that they did at work today. Which way are we thinking about it?

Male: This is Victor. I was thinking that the third bullet, or I guess, the fourth bullet on the page, but we took out the first bullet, um, was more appropriate and maybe worded somewhat differently for the individual assessment.

Female: Which one.

Male: The, what happens to be the fourth bullet under exploratory question 22.

Female: Yeah. I think with regard to this bullet three, when you're talking, when you're talking about them in front of them, like, like they are not there. That's what they're trying to get at. Like they're in the room or nearby and you're talking about them like they are not there. I mean, that's what they're trying to address with the question. It is not typically well.

Male: Yeah.

Male: The reason why I thought it had a better home under the individual assessment we will be doing later. It is presuming the way it is phrased that the provider is going to know, perhaps better than the person, how the person would like to be addressed. I think there's more deference and respect to the individual asking a question like that of the individual.

Female: This is Libby. I think, Michael, right? I think going back to your comment, were under the dignity and respect category, I think you might have been -- I think, the way you're thinking about the question might be around privacy. Is that --

Male: Dignity and respect, I mean the questions you're asking is, when you ask this question, it sounds like you are asking the question like it is not a serving tool. And for me, it would seem like -- and I know whether you say yes or no on here, that your staff is going to do it because there are times when you want to motivate somebody, and you know, sometimes speaking directly to that person is not as easy as well, well it is easy, but it gets more motivating when me and you, who, or they see here are talking about her in such a positive way and you know, although she is not there, to me that is more of a motivating tool, I'm looking at it like this, is like if you're doing them, your downgrading them.

Male: I don't think, in my estimation, this statement doesn't preclude positive statements and affirmations.

Male: Right.

Male: Again, an assumption of reasonableness on the people completing it. It is a good point, Michael, but I think we will be okay. Okay. I believe we're on the last bullet. 22. And I believe, you mentioned that you thought this might be better under individual survey. I think.

Male: Yes.

Female: It would apply to both. I would like to see it left in this survey.

Female: This is Denise, it almost looks like the only two that would be excluded is hung or sweetie (phonetic). It doesn't say such as or anything. It -- it literally just says -- as hung or sweetie.

Female: So --

[Laughter]

Female: Call them anything else you want.

Female: Is there anything such as hung or sweetie?

[Laughter]

Female: God.

Female: So Denise, your recommending that is changed.

Female: Just such as.

Female: Such as.

Male: This is Tim. I think you could just stop the sentence after the draft (phonetic). Does staff address individuals in the manner in which the individual would like to be addressed. Period.

Female: Question mark.

Female: I agree.

Female: I agree.

Female: Yeah.

[Background noise]

Male: That's right.

Female: All right. Tennessee 46.

Male: This is Victor, if we, if, if majority of folks here wants to keep that, is there a problem with also asking that same question of the individual in the individual assessment? I don't know that you always have parallel, um, answers there.

Female: Okay.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Okay.

Male: Okay.

Female: Noted. Tennessee 46.

Male: This is Terry, member experience has to be something unique to Tennessee.

Female: Yeah.

Male: And I suggest we probably don't want to know what it is.

[Laughter]

Male: We provoked that.

Female: I was kind of wondering about the unpaid staff.

Male: Me, too.

Male: Good point. There shouldn't be unpaid that, that would be my thinking.

Male: Terry Macy. Unpaid volunteers.

Male: Right. That's fine.

Male: No.

Female: Yeah.

Female: This is Libby, are there volunteers in his residents?

Male: There very well could be. Going to the community information point you would want folks that are not paid staff involved. So I would leave room for it. But I, I agree with Terry, I don't know -- where Tennessee came up with this one?

[Laughter]

Female: So are we -- this will be Terry -- Olson, what are you representing for this one?

Male: Do paid staff and unpaid volunteers receive and let's take out, um, new hire and just say orientation training and continuing education. On residents rights and do we need an outlined in HCBS rules or is that perhaps an unnecessary qualifier?

Female: This is Melinda. I have a question for our in-home -- shared living provider.

Female: Yes.

Female: Everybody in the home, aside from maybe you, would everybody be trained on the individual's need who is living in the house?

Female: Well, this is pat, they would be trained according to what the ELP suggests.

Female: Okay.

Female: So whatever the ELP suggests that what we would train for. For example, I have a lady now who is being trained to learn how to come in the home with a key.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: And she's doing pretty well, but has not yet reached the goal to be able to come in, but we're working on it. So it's, it's just different things, because you go by the individual of what they need, then I have one individual, a man, he was much on a higher level than her and so he didn't need to -- you know, be introduced to coming in with the key, because he knew how to do that. In and out. So it just depends on what their need is.

Female: And, and so if you, for example, if you're married, your spouse would also be trained on that as well if you had children in the home or --

Female: Anyone.

Female: Well, I'm not sure about that, because I haven't had anyone that they were married. All of mine.

Female: No. I met your family.

Female: Oh, my family, come in with a key. Yes.

Female: So when you receive somebody new. I'm sorry if I'm belaboring this point, I'm trying to get an idea. When you receive someone new into your home, I would imagine it is your family and they're coming into family as well, anybody who's living in the home with you.

Female: Right.

Female: Everybody in the family is trained. Correct.

Female: Yes. Uh-huh. Yes.

Female: Okay.

Female: That helped.

Female: Yeah it did. Okay.

[Laughter]

Female: So Tennessee 46, do paid and unpaid volunteer receive orientation training and continuing education related to resident's rates.

Female: I think you have to add staff after paid.

Female: Paid staff. The rest of it is okay.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Okay. Pennsylvania, next one.

Male: This is Terry again. I like, um, are staff effective oriented and trained on the participants. As opposed to do you.

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: Once more, Terry.

Male: Are staff effectively oriented and trained on all participants' needs, abilities and interests?

Male: This is Tim. I like that, but I'd like to add, ah, staff and part-time, full-time staff and part-time staff, because I think this is training differential in some providers between those two.

Female: This is Libby, can we say are all staff and volunteers?

Male: Yeah. And I agree with you, Tim. In our agency we made a point nobody set foot in a home until they had that orientation or they were shadowed until they had it. But yeah. I hope all staff.

Male: All staff would do it. I would be fine with that.

Male: I would say each instead of all participants. Just emphasizing that each person's needs.

Male: Sure. Victor I finally get it down and you change it to each.

Male: I noticed that, Terry. And I felt bad going to each.

Male: This is Terry. I noticed that.

Female: Okay. This is Libby. Are all staff and voluntaries effectively oriented and trained on each participant's needs, abilities and interests.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Perfect.

Female: Yep.

Female: We're cruising.

[Laughter]

All right. Exploratory question seven.

Female: This is Melinda, I did have a question about the bibs. I mean, that might actually be considered assistive technology for some people.

Male: Yeah. I mean.

Female: To wear proactive covering over their clothes when they eat.

Male: This is Terry, considering the alternative a person going to the community or out in the day program wearing their breakfast. I think there is more dignity in a bib.

Male: You could say as necessary.

Male: Yep. Other part of a PCOC, if people, person-centered plan.

Female: We to have some residents, that do have, unfortunately, severe drooling issues.

Male: Yeah.

Male: Sure.

Female: And they are recommended, we're constantly saying, you know, so-

Female: This is Laura, I'm getting back to the norm is the standard should be you don't have to have a bib unless you need a bib. So it should be they don't have to wear bibs unless there is a reason for them to wear it. Instead of parking everyone down and putting a bib on them. That's what they're trying to get at.

Male: Yes.

Female: Right. So I think it is worth asking the question. I mean, like it is phased one thing, but it should be asked.

Female: Required.

Female: I don't like the word required.

Male: I don't understand the word dignity here, I don't understand what quite means?

Female: I know.

Female: And dignity.

Female: Yeah. Reported to --

Female: (Indiscernible). (Speaker off microphone).

Female: This is Denise, I think they are just referring to the category dignity and respect and a person may feel undignified if they don't need a bib and they have to wear one anyway.

Male: Yep.

Female: That wouldn't feel very dignifying.

Male: Yes. Yeah.

Male: I think the term may, I think the dignity issue is one size fits all. You know.

Female: When you are done, can you join us for a minute?

Male: Sure.

Female: Okay. This is Libby. I think we all agree with what we're throwing out there. Can someone give us words?

Male: This is Tim. I'm okay with Denise's point, keep the dignity in there.

Male: This is Terry. Individuals -- only required to wear bibs when part of a person-centered plan of care. Does that work?

[Laughter]

Female: You're putting too much into his person-centered plan again.

Female: We could put that in every single question.

Male: I know we could.

Female: It doesn't work. Just a yes-no, it kind of gets back to the answers. Right.

Male: When needed?

Female: Laura, can you give us a revision.

Female: I don't have a revision. I like it the way it is.

Male: It is worded -- it is cumbersome worded.

Female: Yeah.

Female: Is it?

Male: You could always.

Female: Two questions maybe.

Male: The flip side you could say do you require all individuals to wear bibs.

Female: There you go.

Male: And if they say yes. They're going to have some explaining to do. If they say no -- um, that is all right.

Male: This is Michael Harris. Is the word opportunity better? Because then, they, we're still keeping dignity, but we're also giving them a choice and affording the opportunity --

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Is it opportunity not to wear a bib or to wear a bib?

Male: Isn't it the opportunity to wear one or not to wear one? Are individuals, the opportunity -- not to --

Female: That wouldn't work for me. That is not what they're trying to get at in the question, I think.

Male: What is it they are trying to get at?

Female: They're trying to get find out whether they're, there's -- individualization in the meal process, basically. Or, or -- are you, is your, it's so easy to treat everybody exactly the same. I mean --

Male: Exactly, the ones that are going to have bibs on, are going to put bibs on, the ones that are not going to have are not going to have. They know who they are.

Male: I think there's a question regarding our staff using judgment and only, um, using bibs selectively when they're needed, but, yeah. I mean it's kind of a-- awkward question, certainly.

Female: The wording is.

Female: This is Libby. I understand the second part of the question. I don't understand the first part of the question. Are individuals required to wear bibs or use disposable cutlery plates on cups. That's a question.

Male: This is Terry, I took out disposable. That just seems -- I mean, is that a problem in homes? I

would hope not.

Female: Only on picnics when we go outside, we use paper plates.

Male: One possible would be required to wear bibs when needed?

Female: (Speaker off microphone).

Female: Can we do like we did before and use a such as. Does the dining room afford the dignity such as not requiring individuals to wear bibs or, um, using disposable cutlery unless -- you know, for picnics or --

[Laughter]

Female: Or does the dining area?

Male: That is a short novel.

Female: Yeah it is.

Female: Does the dining room afford dignity to diners and are all individuals required to wear bibs?

[Laughter]

Or all individuals required to wear bibs. The answer should clearly be no.

Male: Right, that's what I had suggested, if they say yes. Then they obviously have to explain.

Female: Are all individual required to be bibbed?

Female: This is Denise, that would mean that you could require.

Female: No. The answer should be no. The answer should be nod, but not required to wear bibs.in wording is confusing.

Female: This is Libby. Laura, could you repeat what you?

Female: No.

[Laughter]

Female: We have to write it down.

[Laughter]

Female: It is too much time.

Female: Does the dining area afford dignity to the diners?

Female: Well, what I said was something like does the dining area afford dignity to the diners such as -- ah, um -- no use of disposable cutlery or plates and no requirement to, for all to wear bibs or something like that.

Female: Such as not requiring individuals to wear bibs or disposable, blah, blah, blah.

Female: Yeah. Yeah.

Female: I like that.

Female: Does the dining area afford dignity to the diners such as not requiring individuals to wear bibs or use disposable?

Female: That is better.

Male: Yeah. That will work.

Male: Isn't part of dignity also allowing someone to choose who or she wishes to dine with.

Female: That is nothing later.

Female: This is an outlier question.

Male: Right. That is why I think we should consider coupling some of the --

Female: Go somewhere else, but yeah.

Male: Maybe, um, can we parking lot that one?

Female: Yeah -- I'm going to leave it as we just discussed and then we'll, we have another week. Or two.

[Laughter]

All right. Page four, freedom from coercion and restraint. Exploratory question 12. The first sentence there is -- should have been removed.

Male: What is that?

Female: Individuals are free from coercion, that is a statement not a question.

Male: Um, okay. What about are all individuals free from coercion?]

Male: Yep.

Female: Okay. Anything on the remaining bullets.

Male: Yes.

Female: The haircut thing in that one.

Male: With the first, ah, bullet. Um, is information about filing a complaint posted in obvious location and in a format understandable to individuals? I think it is this phrase -- better --

Male: This is Terry. One on the challenges you're going to face there is some individuals aren't going to understand any format. So um.

Male: Right, but that's where I think we -- have the opportunity for them to explain.

Female: Thank you.

Male: I can live with it either way.

Female: Is information about filing a complaint posted in an obvious location and in a format understandable to all individuals.

Male: Individuals.

Female: You didn't say that Victor.

Male: I know, I'm slipping.

[Laughter]

Female: Are we okay with that one? For now. All right. Are individuals comfortable discussing concerns? Anything on the rest.

Male: I was wondering about are all individuals comfortable raising concerns? Discussing seems a little bit more involved than some people may have the capacity to do. Raising seems to be a lower bar.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Raising. Okay. Change that. Are all individuals comfortable raising concerns. Next bullet.

Male: All.

Female: Anything else?

Male: No.

Female: No.

Female: Next bullet.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Anything else in the last three, or let's start with the next two. Can individuals -- file an anonymous complaint, do individuals have freedom to make a complaint.

Male: Just go with all on those.

Female: All right. And we've had a lot of discussion around haircuts.

Male: Yeah. Are we going to keep that or --

Female: I would like to delete it.

Female: I would like to delete it.

Female: I would like to delete it.

Female: Would anybody like to keep it?

Male: Are we going to find a home for it somewhere else?

Female: Can we find a home for it on page three-

[Low audio]

Where it says individuals need assistance with grooming can we add-in there something about hairstyles as they choose?

Female: Such as --

Female: I think that is perfect.

Male: This is Tim, that's kind of an important issue for me. Because my son has massive scars and one provider cut his hair way too short and all of this scars popped out. So I take care of it from that point forward. But, it is -- at least for me, an issue.

Female: Do you want it under the coercion, what do you think?

Male: I'm fine with where it is, frankly.

Male: Yeah. I have trouble envisioning how a haircut is coercion or restraint.

Female: I think we talked about this before and the issue is probably, back in the day.

Male: Yeah.

Female: They would give everybody the same haircut and no individual input about what kind of hairstyle they wanted. We're going to give you this cut, this is what we do. I could see it going somewhere else, though, and throwing better.

Male: I think it is important for keeping in the point that Laura is raising and what the new CMS rule is about giving individuals meaningful choice.

Female: So this is Libby, can we change it then, do individuals have the choice of their haircut or hairstyle?

Male: This is Tim, that would be fine for me.

Male: At the same time I know that can be difficult to, um, make reality. Given that some people, um, it is very difficult to have some people with, for example, extreme autism to, ah, sit still for exactly the kind of cut they or their parents or, or, they want them to have.

Female: This is Libby, but different haircuts or styles, if somebody get has cool haircut, I mean, and they choose to have the same haircut so be it.

Male: I'm all for giving them the choice.

Female: Well, I think we just need to throw choice into this bullet. Somewhere.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Yep.

Female: The cover it. So who is our wordsmith here?

Female: Exactly.

Female: Do individuals have a choice in their haircut and other hairstyle?

Male: That is fine.

Male: Yep.

Female: All right. South Dakota. Are restraints utilized in your setting?

Male: I would recommend is restraint ever utilized in your setting rather than are restraints utilized. Um, I -- fear that some providers could, in the way that it is currently phrased, ah, um, think that we're talking about certain, um, tools of restraint. Restraints being something rather than the practice of restraint, which would include, um, certain tools or simply somebody holding someone's hands down.

Female: This is Libby. Can we phrase that the same way as we did above, are all individuals free from restraint?

Male: Well, this is Terry. Um, isn't restraint still sometimes part of a person-centered plan of care?

Male: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Male: So recognizing that, here is what I suggested are restraints only utilized in your setting when part of a person-centered plan of care approved by the interdisciplinary team and human rights committee?

Female: Or emergency. Because they will even tell you in peace, which we all have to take. I'm sorry. This is Melinda, that the only time we're allowed to use restraints if the person is in immediate danger to themselves.

Male: Or others. You're right.

Female: So the way that you ask that question, we're probably going to have to say, yes. If somebody is going to run out the door into the road, we would have to restrain them, because as a practice we don't retrain people. So I like Terry, what you said, but maybe we could put --

Male: Or emergencies.

Female: Emergency situations.

Female: I don't think that we should be tying all of the questions to the person-centered plan of care. But I think you can say yes or no, and provide the documentation. What is their policy on restraint, we will use it in emergencies so you can't say we never ever use it, but we only use it --

Female: So every would have to stay yes across the board then?

Female: Probably, then.

Female: I have never used a restraint ever.

Male: Um, well.

Female: This is Libby.

Female: Someone said to me, restraint. This sounds to me like restraints like your holding them or tying them down with something. I think we're bringing up two different things.

Male: That's what he is getting at.

Female: She is going if someone is going to run away, then you're going to.

Male: Of course.

Female: I think that some something different than what is being asked in the question.

Male: Yeah. The other thing, this is Terry. You run into here is, um, emergency restraints for physicians, which is kind of -- going off on a tangent, I recognize, but --

Male: I also think it is potentially dangerous and limiting to keep this question focused on simply the policy of, of the setting, because I know and I'm sure a number of people at this table know of any number of -- settings where policies have been breached and people have been restrained nonetheless.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: And I think it is a real important question. Because either it goes far beyond uniforms and haircuts. Which, which -- are being addressed for a reason here as well. Because there are places which are, um, quite liberal in their use.

Female: Okay. So this is Libby. I think I'm hearing that maybe we need two questions on this. And who would like to offer up suggestions?

Male: This is Tim, I wonder if we could avoid that by saying what type of restraints are utilized in your setting?

Female: That is really not --

Male: Then if they say none. That takes care of the thing. If they say this is what we do for emergencies, daw, daw, daw --

Female: This is Denise, I think you want to be absolutely assured that restraints of any kind are not used as a punishment.

Female: That is another question.

Male: Yes. That is a very good point.

Female: I have seen it happen at an immediate care facility at the campus center where you get locked in a treatment room.

Male: This is Terry. That's just a small part of it.

Female: I mean, that's.

Male: The may not be used for punishment, but it still may be inappropriate, unnecessary, and very dangerous. So you have a lot of scenarios there.

Female: This is Lisa. I have a question, and maybe this goes somewhere else, but aren't (Indiscernible) medications --

Male: No you're getting into chemical restraint.

Female: I mean.

Female: Is that clear?

Female: No.

Female: This is Melinda, they indeed, that's why we have to have them approved --

Female: But I think.

[Background noise]

Female: Is it coming later?

Male: Is there still an EMBUS process. Emergency medical, or is that medical emergency -- I have been away so long, I'm forgetting acronyms.

Female: That pile of information Fran and Eddie gave us, had to deal with all of this stuff. Crisis --

Male: One possibly might be emergency restraints are only used in accordance with all DDDS regulations and requirements. And, and, but, unless we can --

Female: (Speaker off microphone).

Male: Does that work? Unless, we want to describe those requirements more specifically.

Female: There's a policy. There is Libby. There is a policy here called behavior and/or mental health support policy and it goes into all different kinds of things. Um, environmental restrictions, um -- mechanical restraint, physical intervention, behavior, plans, chemical restraints --

Male: Yeah.

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: Yeah.

Female: So maybe we can -- somehow.

Male: You just opened another six cans of worms.

Female: Can we just direct the question to this policy?

Female: This page of policy.

Male: Terry Macy again. Are you compliant with DDDS policy, blah, blah, blah. Yeah.

Male: Um, again, what is the -- go ahead.

Female: This is Denise, that would also cover because it is not on the providers -- that answer these questions, but it is also the policy of the state. So if DDDS has to change their policy in any way?

Male: Okay.

Female: That would be simple for the providers to abide by that policy.

Male: Are we going to say restraints or emergency restraints, include both or do you want them separate still?

Female: Well, aren't we just referring to this policy? That includes all of it.

Male: Yeah.

Male: Okay. So I have a suggestion then.

Female: Thank you.

Male: Restraints are only used for individuals in compliance with all applicable DDDS regulations and requirements.

Male: Policies. Policies and --

Male: Policies and requirements.

Male: Policies and regulations.

Male: Policies and regulations. Okay.

Female: Write that down.

Male: This is Tim. Is there a number on that.

Male: Where are they?

Female: I don't know, Fran or Eddie gave it to us, the other one well, we gave out that pile of stuff two weeks ago. Actually, I don't see a number. The date of revision is 2009. It's the behavior and/or mental health support policy.

Male: Okay.

Female: I'm sorry. Did they have a number on that?

Female: No. No. Number.

Male: That is part of which document?

Male: The policies.

Female: And then exhibits and all kinds of forms.

Male: Oh, yes.

Female: Give that one to me again.

Male: Yeah. Restraints are only used.

Female: This is the question restraints only used with --

Male: With individuals in compliance with all applicable policies, DDDS policies and regulations.

Female: Such as -- that.

Male: Nope, not such as. There is a bunch of them has I recall.

Female: Okay. Restraints are.

Female: Nobody else, there are other regulations besides DDDS that applies?

Male: Um --

Female: For restrains.

Male: With DDDS and other applicable policies and regulations?

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: Sorry. Libby.

Male: And other, what?

Male: Restraints are only used with individuals in compliance with DDDS and other applicable policies and regulations.

Male: The latter part of that opens it up to just about anything, doesn't it?

Male: Which part?

Male: And other applicable, this, not and the other --

Male: Yeah. But I mean -- we're just looking at state laws, Federal laws.

Male: Federal laws. Federal as well as state ones.

Male: Yeah. I mean there may be a better way to say it, but.

Female: Can we leave it like this and take a look at it again next week?

Male: This is Victor, I really would like to look at it again. Because I'm just looking at the list of the state's definition of physical and restraint interventions and in my mind it is incredibly broad. I would say far too broad, which opens, um, opportunities for abuse.

Female: Okay.

Female: Well, I agree with you, but we're going to focus on the goal of this particular question is in this, it is just.

Male: Context.

Female: Yeah. Obviously DDDS cares a great deal about the compliance with the restraint. You know, whether it is being used appropriately or not. This is not how they are going to get at it, at the end of the day.

Male: So what do you see, Laura, is it is inclusionary as far as?

Female: Well, because.

Male: In context of the CMS rule.

Female: Well, they are looking for individual in restraint. You want to affirm, yes. They are, but nitty-gritty questions about restraint, this is probably not the place to do it. Just saying. I don't know how far you want to go with the question. Either you ask one question or you ask 50. That's the problem with it.

Female: Yeah.

Female: So I don't know how far.

Male: Yeah. Speaking as former provider I think restraints are always looked at very intensely by QA folks. So, um --

Female: I think restraints don't really exist.

Male: In many, in many agencies.

Female: For many agencies.

Male: Unless there is an emergency?

If unless an emergency or a plan.

Female: My other problem, I only see the bad stuff. I only see the bad stuff and it does happen. I'm glad it doesn't happen regularly, but I think it is still happening.

Female: But if it is happening and people see the bad stuff -- stuff in this survey, people are not going to admit to it anyway.

Female: Maybe they will be.

Female: Unfortunately, when you do the look behind?

Female: I'm saying this is not going to address the restraint problem, it is basically asking them to affirm.

Male: Yeah. This is time, nobody is mentioning their names. This can be very confusing on tape.

Female: Well, I think it is, a lot of these things.

Female: That is Laura.

Female: Sorry. Yeah. Laura. Yeah. In a lot of these situations there is compliance almost across the board, but a few that are not quite following it.

Male: Okay. One comment and then we want to move on. But what is wrong given this conversation of saying is restraint ever uses all in your setting and then explain.

Female: That's not, there is nothing wrong with that.

Male: This is Terry. I think that is just so wide open it is not a specific as the question about if it is used, is it used in compliance with applicable regs and policies. I acknowledge Victor that is not perfect either. Because you are speaking in broad terms, but can bring up any applicable policies and regulations and they are reasonably being followed.

Male: I suspect -- I suggest we get, come back to this maybe.

Female: Okay. What I would like to do is leave -- the question as is and include the second question, the second question that we came up with, restraints are only used with individuals in compliance with DDDS and other applicable policies and regulations. And then we need to take a look at that again.

Male: Yep.

Female: So if you are notes open that, please come to the table next week with suggestions. Specific questions for that one. Next is South Dakota six.

Male: This is Terry Olson. Is due process going to be defined somewhere? Is there going to be -- ah -- definitions that accompany any of this.

Female: We can include definitions if we want to.

Male: Laura, could come up with.

Female: Laura. I don't know what they mean.

Male: They can vary. Yes.

Female: I think this is a South Dakota term.

Male: Yeah. I don't know if due process is the -- reference.

Male: Yeah.

Male: There might be areas that are not, that may be present risks for an individual.

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: And not on a person by person basis -- you know. Restrictions.

Male: This is Tim, I was totally confused by this question.

Male: Same.

Male: I would toss out the due process stuff, and I simply say areas in the setting that are restricted to individuals and just leave it as that. There should be an explanation if there is a restriction?

Male: I can live with that.

Female: Where there areas in the setting that are restricted.

Female: Hmm. Yeah.

Male: To individuals.

Female: To individuals.

Male: Would that be restrictive to individuals? Um, because this is about the individuals can go some places and they can't go in others. That's what they are getting at, right.

Male: Restricted to, restrictive.

Male: To say restricted to individuals it make -- it is restricted to them, but not wild animals.

Male: I see what you're saying. I get you.

Female: Everybody is included, basically.

Female: Are their areas in the setting that are restrictive to individuals?

Male: Boy, that still sounds odd to me.

Male: It does to me, too, this is Tim. I'm thinking.

Male: From which individuals are restricted. How about that?

Female: From which.

Male: From which individuals are restricted. Are their areas in the setting from which individuals are restricted?

Male: This is Tim. That's okay.

Male: That's okay.

Female: Are their areas in the setting?

Male: I'm thinking of the hot stove issue in the kitchen.

Male: And basements without the second egress it is restricted.

Female: Restricted. Are their areas in the setting from which individuals are restricted?

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: Isn't someone involved. This is Victor, isn't someone involved in a look behind going to know what those are, otherwise, it is completely open-ended.

Male: They're going to have to explain it.

Male: Right.

Male: Any time there is a yes.

Male: Right.

Female: Right.

Female: All right. Tennessee 31.

Male: All.

Male: I think that's-- oh.

Male: Do all individuals?

Male: Yep.

Female: Anything else? Agree with that?

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Ah, five. Three bullets.

Male: Do all individuals and at the end, do the individuals desire.

Female: Say that again.

Male: Do all individuals personal items such as pictures, books, and memorabilia present and arranged as the individual's desire.

Male: I think are all. Right? Not do all.

Male: Ah.

Male: Are all, I think still works.

Male: Right. Right.

Male: Right.

Female: Anybody opposed to that. Any other changes first bullet? Second bullet?

Male: This is Terry Olson and I would add and needs?

Male: Where?

Male: At the end. At the end.

Male: Um.

Male: And the two aren't always going to be necessarily the same is my experience. I mean, if you worked with some people with autism, they want something in a place that maybe totally dangerous for themselves or others. So it is kind of a -- nuance question.

Male: So you're suggesting needs rather than choices.

Male: No personal choices and needs.

Male: I needs.

Male: (Speaker off microphone).

Male: I'm sorry.

Male: And/or.

Male: Sure.

Female: This is Denise. I think if you add needs onto to it, that is sometimes be subjectively restrictive to choice. Did I say that right?

Female: Well, it does restrict choice.

Female: Yeah. It duffs restrict choice. Someone will say, well, you don't need that.

[Laughter]

Male: Well, right.

Female: I know that sounds convoluted, but it can restrict choice.

Male: Um, this is Victor, also -- I'm wondering about as far as cost and practicality, whether it is do available furniture, linens and other household items, it is, if there is not something defining that, um, we could have the most ornate rooms imaginable.

Male: Right.

Female: So.

Male: Although, I'm just thinking allowed here, if it ask just available, there are probably some homes that need to invest far more than they are, because what is available would not be a meaningful choice for anyone. So.

Female: This is Denise. I know it is reflected in the CMS. I don't know where suggestions or part of their rules or -- but it says that the individual should have choice of their furnishings and decorating their

space.

Male: Space.

Female: And that's addressed.

Female: And I think that is what this is supposed to reflect.

Male: That's right.

Female: They have choice, this is Lisa, and they pay for all their own decorations and their own rooms. Just like we do.

Female: And --

Male: (Speaker off microphone).

Male: One possibly would be are appropriate, um, furniture --

Male: Paying for their own furniture.

Female: No. No.

Male: Right, because furniture.

Female: Right, decorating their bedroom.

Male: Right. Right. Here it is. Are appropriate furniture, linens and other household items available which reflect the individual's personal choices?

Female: This is Laura, how about we flip the question around and say does the individual's personal choices, does the individual have a choice regarding furniture, linens and other household items. I guess what they are asking is do you, are there -- are they allowed to choose these things or not? And that way, because, if you look at the third bullet and it is asking more about, well, no. It is not. I'm trying to get it to be parallel to the other question.

Female: Um --

Female: So Laura, this is Libby. You were saying do individuals.

Female: -- I think what they're trying to get at, not so much is that, what Denise is saying, which is, does the person have -- a say in, is it, or are they allowed to choose the furniture, linens and household items or just provided to them regardless. So is there a way to phrase that to better reflect that. And if they're not, as Terry Olson is saying if they have not, there is a reason they are not. It is because there is some danger involved or whatever. Safety issue.

Male: Let me take another crack at it and I don't think there's a perfect one here, but are appropriate furnishings, decorations and other household items available which reflect the individual's personal choices.

Male: That's all right. But I would take out the word appropriate.

Male: Well, I was just dealing with sufficiency and your point about --

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: Yeah. So. Maybe there is a better way?

Male? Administrators could be saying what is appropriate, rather than the whole point that.

Male: Adequate.

Male: The hope is appropriate.

Female: And decide, I agree with Victor. If you put the word appropriate in there. Sometimes it helps if your turn it around to yourself and take a look.

Male: So would adequate or necessary make it a little bit more safe?

Female: This is Melinda, I really like what you're saying about choice. When you talk about appropriate, I know people who are in their 40s and they have Elmo dolls in their room, I would not want to start that slide, that is not appropriate for you to have in your room. Maybe we are thinking a little bit too much into it, and we should go with the person's choice.

Female: This is Denise. On the aside, my 50-year-old son is --

Male: Say, who.

Female: Steam hunk, a heavy metal band from the 1800s science function. You should see this place.

Male: Yeah. I agree. People, people have their, their-

Female: Not appropriate, but you know.

Female: All right. This is Libby. Terry, can you read that again, please.

Male: I'm going to take out in response here, I think what we have here are furnishings, decorations and other household items available which reflect the individual's personal choices. Does that work?

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Yes.

Female: This is Denise, I hate to interject, but if you put available in there it almost --

Female: It does.

Female: Okay. Denise, can you recommend another word?

Male: Present.

Female: Sure. Just -- go decorations and furnishes reflect their personal choice.

Male: Correct.

Male: Okay.

Female: Isn't that what we have here originally.

Female: Yeah.

Female: This is Denise, I think we're reading way too much into this questions. I really think these are pretty basic. I'm just saying.

Male: Well.

Female: Again.

Male: So I think what we ended up with is.

Male: It is pretty close to the original, do furnishings, decorations and other household items reflect individual personal choices.

Female: Yes.

Male: I think I'm going to go look for a wall to bang my head against.

[Laughter]

Male: (Speaker off microphone).

Female: (Speaker off microphone).

[Laughter]

Female: All right. Third bullet, do individuals living areas reflect their interests and hobbies?

Male: This is Tim. I like it, I think its fine.

[Laughter]

Female: Good job. Tim, I agree. Anybody opposed. Okay. Connecticut 33.

Male: As each individual prefers.

Male: Right.

Female: May I add, this is Melinda, or requires. We do need to arrange furniture at times due to the fact that some people are blind and have mobility issues.

Female: And have mobility issues?

Female: Is furniture?

Male: Assistive technology.

Female: Is furniture arranged as individual preferred or required?

Female: Right. We can't have it in front of windows.

Female: Is everybody okay with that. Next is five.

Male: And --

Female: I'm sorry. Victor, what was that?

Male: And.

Female: Does an individual's schedule vary.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Anybody else have anything on that one, are we okay?

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Requires exploratory seven.

Male: Do all individuals have any overtime in place of their choosing. (phonetic).

Female: Anybody opposed. Bullet two?

Female: Bullet three, this is Lisa. We talked about snacks any time. We do have limitations.

Female: We didn't get past bullet two yet. Sorry. Are we all in agreement with bullet two.

Female: Yes.

Female: Okay. Lisa can you say that again.

Female: Number three, are snacks accessible and available at any time. We have discussed before there are limitations for the any time. Do to dietary issues, nutritional.

Male: Right.

Female: But I think.

Male: That is.

Female: A response.

Male: Right.

Female: Everybody is aware.

Female: In the person-centered plan. I'm kidding.

[Laughter]

Female: You know that document that is out.

Male: This is Tim. If we lock the door, we can move right along here.

Female: Can I be a stickler, on bullet two, I can request a Mercedes-Benz, but it doesn't mean I'm going to get one. So can we change the word request to obtained (phonetic).

Female: And if they can request, whatever is in the house, if they want Cheerios and we only have frosted flakes. We're not going to run to the store.

Female: No, no. I got you, but are alternatives available? That's a better way -- a better way to ask the question.

Female: Yeah.

Female: But request. Anybody can request anything. Right.

Male: Yeah.

Female: So Laura, you're saying can the individual obtain an alternative meal if desired and as available.

Male: Not as available. If it is not available you're not getting anywhere.

Female: Yeah.

Female: Lisa, what did you just recommend?

Female: How about does the individual, um, have access to alternative meals, ah, as -- or as available -- um -- well, this is alternative meal, it doesn't have to say it is exactly what they want. So I think it works.

Female: Right.

Male: Is the individual given appropriate --

Female: We're talking about seven.

Male: Yeah. Is the individual given opportunities for alternative meals if desired.

Male: This is Tim. I think Laura, you had it, can an individual obtain an alternative meal if desired, period.

Male: It works.

Male: And I would say any. Does any individual?

[Laughter]

Female: Can any individual obtain an alternative meal if desired. Bullet three. Oh, wait a minute.

Male: I would say if an individual providers --

Female: Are you still on two?

Male: That was on three. Or, I'm sorry -- um, ah --

Female: Are we leaving the third bullet as is?

Female: Yeah.

Female: Anybody opposed.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Exploratory question eight. The first bullet I didn't really like the way that was worded, do individuals have the option to sit where they prefer in the dining areas.

Male: That works.

Female: Bullet two. Anybody oppose that? Changes.

Male: Do all individuals converts with --

Female: I had do all individuals have the opportunity to converse with others during mealtimes.

Male: I like that.

Male: Yeah. That's fine.

Female: Bullet three.

Male: If an individual desires to -- can she do --

Female: Where are they eating? Where what do you think that is getting at, I'm curious.

Male: (Indiscernible).

Male: I'm sorry. What was your answer?

Male: Bedrooms.

Female: Or outside.

Female: Outside.

Female: We don't always encourage bedrooms because of bugs. And trust me, when they eat in bedrooms we get bugs.

Male: Yeah. I understand the objective here, this is Terry Olson, but boy it does get problematic you get spills and ground in food in carpets.

Male: This is Victor, I understand it, too, but I think -- with the, it has to all go towards what works for the individual. Because of anxiety and transition, issues for any number of people they just cannot eat in communal settings.

Male: Yeah, and as stated here, this is Terry Olson again, I think that is probably close to an appropriate question as we can get.

Female: If an individual desires to eat privately, can he/she do so anybody opposed. Page five, Hawaii. This is the combination question. And I just combined I think three into one here and just threw in all of the examples.

Female: This is Lisa. For A, unfortunately, they don't really get to get up at their own convenience during the week when they want to. Only because of day programs, dart, everything, just like you and I have schedules, but on weekends they do whatever they want, you know what I mean, that's really the only time that they --

Male: Uh-huh.

Male: Right. But isn't the intent of CMS here, they just don't want it to be regimented and everyone has to go lock step with everyone else.

Female: Right. But Monday through Friday, I mean, there are things to take into consideration with --
Male: Uh-huh.

Female: I understand what CMS is saying, but the same thing with us, we have to get up and go to work. They have to take dart buses. Being realistic, so what kind of answer are you looking for, that's what I'm saying.

Female: This is Laura. On the other hand, you might get up as 6:00 and I might get up at 7:00 and we both have to be to work at 8:00. I mean, you know what I mean, there is some individual, even with that little window you can have some choice if possible. It is possible to have choice worked into that. Um --

Female: I don't know -- is it something, you could, if you're going to say no you can explain it -- at this particular setting these residents have to be, the bus comes at such-and-such a time and they have to be up by such-and-such, maybe that's how you cover that.

Male: Then again, this is why, you know, the focus, I just want to go to the beach, and they want to surf.
[Laughter]

Male: A little bit more laid-back.

Male: It is very laid-back. Exactly.

Male: This term, isn't the real issue rhythm of life and anyone supported has the opportunity to have a normal rhythm of life?

Male: Yes.

Female: That's true. But we can't use that as a question.

[Laughter]

Too general.

Male: But I think that's a good point.

Female: Well, then we would say -- follow a schedule just like people without disabilities.

Male: Correct.

Female: For all of these questions.

Male: Yeah.

Male: But if you also skipped to the next question, Connecticut and get past Hawaii, they are getting that point, the point of this.

Female: It is choice. Yeah.

Male: This is Tim, that's a good point. Maybe you don't need that whole Hawaii thing and just go with Connecticut seven.

Male: I don't know if Connecticut.

Male: AKA Hawaii.

Male: If you want with Connecticut saying are all individuals able to choose.

Female: Are you already wordsmithing, Victor. Are we scrapping Hawaii, everybody agree? Yes. Okay.

Male: We're looking at idea of scrapping.

Female: Go ahead. Are --

Male: Are all individuals able to choose their own schedules separate from housemates or other individual's schedules and the apostrophe is on the wrong place on housemates. It should be after the S.

Female: Got it was are individuals able to choose thane own schedule separate from house mails and other individual's schedules.

Female: I like that.

Female: I like that.

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: Tennessee 36.

Male: Why do you have to have the word, this is Victor. Why do you have to have the word scheduled. Because the curfew, I mean, isn't that implied?

Female: Is there a curfew or other requirements for a return to setting. Can we just leave it is there a curfew or other --

Male: This is Tim, curfew means much more than just.

Female: Uh-huh.

Male: A time to return to the residential setting.

Male: Right, because a restriction, exactly.

Female: Doors locked, lights out.

Male: Right.

Female: Tim, would you like to suggest something else there?

Male: Is there a curfew or other restrictions for a return -- for leaving or returning to the setting. I don't know.

Female: Can we turn that around, do individuals have?

Male: Providers. Do you guys have curfews? I never heard of a curfew.

Female: No.

Female: This is Libby?

Male: I would toss the whole question, frankly.

Female: Yeah. Well, it is a choice of coming and going.

Female: Right.

Female: That we're getting at. Do individuals have the choice --

Male: But the freedom to come and go as they chose without, um, without restriction.

Male: Yeah. There you go, that's good.

Female: This is Melinda. I hate to add more onto it.

Male: Go ahead.

Female: But we do have people who cannot leave the residents on their own.

Male: Absolutely.

Female: You know, I don't want it to get lumped into that. And I don't have another suggestion.

Male: This is Terry Olson. I realize this is kind of, um, unpopular sentiment, but in previous agencies I worked at with CQL, any time we restricted, we had to include a reference as to why it was restricted in the individual plan of care.

Female: Absolutely.

Male: That is not an unreasonable requirement, in some cases it is simply be a sentence or two, but -- you know, that's, that's just my experience and I did, although at first it seemed cumbersome it did ultimately make sense.

Male: Which is why, this is Victor, which is why I think the two paired together work. Do all individuals have the freedom to come and go as they please without -- ah, hourly restrictions, something like that. And if, and if -- um the answer is no, then you're going to be explaining it, and it would almost always, hopefully simply come under what you're talking about, Melinda.

Female: Right. With their ALP plan says.

Male: Right.

Female: This is Lisa. There are many sites like staff department, not staff department, but drop in supports where they might not get as much supervision, they are on their own sometimes it might be a needs thing, if you are going to run on the streets you have to come back at 10:00. So there may be sites out there that have that?

Male: So do you have the sentence or --

Female: Okay. We are changing 36 to do all individuals have the freedom to come and go as they please without restrictions.

Male: That's good.

Female: Exploratory 14.

Male: Um --

Female: That was my little comment in there.

Male: Ah.

Male: How about, um, are visitors allowed to visit individuals in the home in an unrestricted manner.

Female: At any time.

Male: At any time.

Male: Um --

Male: Um, say that again.

Male: Are visitors allowed to visit individuals in the home in an unrestricted manner at any time seems a bit redundant to me, but.

Male: This is Tim, I would remove a restricted manner and just put in any time.

Female: Well, I think it is the people living there, they can invite visitors to come in at any time, not at the visitors are allowed to come in at any time.

Male: I like that, Libby. Allowed to invite.

Female: Okay. So read that one to me again.

Male: Sounds good.

Male: Are individuals allowed to invite visitors --

Female: In the home.

Male: In an unrestricted manner or what did you want to say, Tim.

Male: I don't know.

Male: At any time.

Male: At any time.

Female: At any time.

Male: At any time works for me.

Male: I think that's better.

Female: At any time. Are individuals allowed to invite visitors in the home at any time?

Male: To the home.

Female: To the home.

Male: You might, I'm sorry. This is Tim, to the residential setting be as we're talking about four different settings here.

Male: Hopefully they are all home, but --

Male: Uh-huh, my son is an apartment, not a big deal. But --

Male: Yeah.

Female: All right. So where did that come from? Is that instead of the first?

Male: First.

Male: First bullet.

Female: Okay. So we're scratching the first bull and the replacing it with are individuals allowed to invite visitors to the home or residential setting at any time.

Male: And then I think if you keep the last two bullets, if everyone thinks they are necessary, I think we're done with it, aren't we?

Male: The second bullet, um --

Male: That's already redundant to the first one.

Female: This is Denise, not if the answer would be no.

[Laughter]

Male: Well, our visitors allowed, how did we say it?

Female: Are individuals allowed to invite visitors to the home at any time.

Male: If the answer to that is yes. Then the answer to the second bullet is answered.

Female: But if the answer is no.

Female: They would have to explain why.

Male: They would have to explain why.

Female: Victor, did you have a comment on the second bullet?

Male: Um, something about the, the -- um, ah, the individuals, um, understand that policy in the first bullet I think it is important. Because we're saying the way that we phrase it is that, people can come and go whenever they want, um, as a policy, and then, of course there can be restrictions to those, as we discussed, but -- post, something, posted or -- um -- that, you know, that's the policy. Um, of the place. I think it is useful, I mean that's why they were looking for the second bullet. Are visitor hours posted?

Male: I think the second bullet might be are individuals aware of their right to invite visitors.

Female: The visitation policy.

Male: Or are they made aware?

Female: Visitation policy.

Female: This is Melinda. Or do you have a policy that restricts visitors?

Male: That is the question.

Female: Um and visiting hours.

Male: We already have that in the first, that issue was addressed I think in the first bullet that we revised, but --

Female: Trying to save space.

Female: I want to ask this question, this is Laura, do you have unrestricted visitors, if somebody showed up at 1:00 in the morning would you let them in. I wouldn't in my house.

Female: That's going to be the tough thing. Because if that was indeed the case, I would have one young gentleman who would have a line of ladies until 4:00 in the morning and his housemates would be like up in arms. So we sit down and make sort of house rules that everyone agrees on like you would do with your roommates, and that's what my answer is probably going to be to that.

Female: So yes. Based on house rules.

Male: Well, that's going to be an issue, absolutely.

Female: I think for most people will, a lot of people will look at this, you would feel the same way. You wouldn't want your person having people come in at 2:00 in the morning.

Female: So --

Female: I'm sorry. What we're trying to get at, they want people to feel free to visit at any time, like when you have a baby in a childcare center, you want to think I can go in at any time and see exactly what is going on. So I think the same thing, that there's openness about the place, um, so I think it is more what they are trying to get at, but I wonder about 24-hour visitation. I disagree (phonetic).

Female: (Speaker off microphone).

Female: Yeah. But I think.

Female: So we came up with the question, um, and we're looking at bullet two, do we need bullet two?

Female: This is -- Eddie, would you want to put the house rules posted?

Female: I think.

Male: And.

Female: And in other questions I thought it was too institutional to post things like that.

Female: Right.

Female: I agree.

Female: I think this is going to be a different answer, this is Lisa, for every site. I mean some sites it will be a knowledge issue. Some sites like she has will be an issue. So you are able to justify the answer.

Male: One alternative is are individuals made aware of their rights to have visitors. Does that work?

Female: Did you write it down?

Male: Yes.

Female: Can you repeat it, please.

Male: Are individuals made aware of their right to have visitors. You already defined that should already be pretty much unrestricted -- so --

Male: I think that's good.

Male: This is Tim, my apologies to the group -- I have a 4:30 appointment that I got to get to in Newark. So I will see you all next Thursday and I expect that this entire document will be --

[Laughter]

Sign, sealed and delivered by then.

Female: Yeah.

Female: This is Lisa. Have a good weekend?

Male: You, too, thanks.

Female: Oh, man, we're not even halfway through.

Male: I know, but we're doing well, I think.

Female: Okay.

Female: All right. So back to bullet two, can we scratch that?

Male: I think we can scratch that.

Female: Bullet three.

Female: This is Laura, what does that mean? Can somebody explain what it means? I don't know what the means.

Male: I think, this is Terry Olson, in ID notes what we used to call them, T notes, whatever, all visitors are documented.

Female: So.

Male: So that would be reflected in their individual record.

Female: So this would be evidence that the provider would have that they indeed, that people are coming in.

Male: I think that they are walking the walk.

Female: All right.

Male: Not just talking it.

Male: Now, one of the challenges there, this is Terry Olson again, some persons may have many friends and visitors and others may have very few, so --

Male: Uh-huh.

Female: But these things are believe can be explained.

Female: Yeah.

Male: Yeah.

Female: So are we okay with that bullet as is?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Female: Last bullet.

Male: This is Victor, I thought this last bullet was phrased in a very confusing way. What does it mean?

Female: I don't understand.

Male: I mean.

Female: This is Laura, is there only one place in the settle where you can visit. You can only visit in the den. You're not allowed to visit in the bedroom.

Male: Terry Macy. The only institution (Indiscernible), you brought to a front room, you would never be allowed to see anybody's bedroom.

Male: So is this more like our visitor is restricted to one public area. Is that what they are getting at?

Female: Yeah.

Female: Uh-huh.

Female: Well -- do individuals have the choice to -- open their doors to visitors, um, in different areas of the house or something like that.

Female: This is Denise, a positive answer might be -- just -- went out of my mind.

[Laughter]

Is there an area where -- the person can have visitors in private.

Female: I think this has to do with the freedom of having visitors come into their home and you go wherever you want to go, right? With your visitor. Not that you're always going to be allowed to do that.

Male: Right. So this is do visitors have access to the individual's private room and -- um, the common, the, the.

Male: Yeah.

Male: The place's common area.

Male: I got a possibility here. Are individuals given the opportunity to meet with visitors in common areas or their private bedroom.

Male: That's good.

Female: Sounds good.

Male: Right.

Male: Or.

Male: And, I think it should be ask.

Male: And works for me.

Female: All right. Let's go to exploratory number nine.

Male: I thought it was worded awkwardly. This is Victor. What about do staff and all individuals about their needs and preferences for services and supports?

Male: I had an alternative, too, are staff appropriately aware of each individual's supports needed -- service -- support services and -- needs. Supports -- services --

Male: But isn't there a difference, Terry, this is Victor, of, are they aware versus, um.

Male: Do they honor?

Male: Well, do they honor and are they actually asking, they think they're aware, but that's -- not coming from anything other than.

Male: The problem I have there Victor is a lot of nonverbal folks. So --

Male: Yes. Well, nonverbal, well -- nonverbal can communicate any number of other ways?

Male: You're right there, too.

Male: But you are also concerned about folks who have difficulty communicating.

Female: Okay. And we're running out of time. So -- I need to catch up.

Male: Let me take a crack at it.

Female: Hold on before you crack.

Male: Okay.

Female: Are individuals given the opportunity to meet with visitors in common areas?

Male: And their private bedrooms.

Male: Right.

Female: Okay. Okay.

Male: Are staff appropriately aware of and responsive to individual support needs and preferences.

Male: Terry Macy. Is the word appropriate subjective?

Female: Staff has to be --

[Low audio]

Service.

Male: Can you repeat that, please.

Male: Effectively, are staff effectively, that sounds a little bit awkward, are staff effectively -- aware of and responsive to individual support needs and preferences?

Female: Taking the word service out.

Male: Yeah. I just.

Female: That is.

Male: That seems too broad to me.

Female: And what would the --

Female: Do away of how to make a service request. What is that?

Male: Well, the proof I think it is an interview with the staff and if somebody knows somebody's routines and.

Female: Right.

Male: I would start with tell me about this person's routines and preferences.

Female: Oh, I agree with that, the service request part.

Male: Yeah. Service I would leave out.

Female: Back up, I'm sorry. This is Laura, the whole subject area is services and supports. So I don't think we can take those words out of the question.

Female: But I don't know what they mean by services?

Female: This goes back to what Fran, Fran gave us before, and it was defined as.

Female: Right. And it is not the providers.

Female: Day services, employment services.

Female: Right and it is not the provider's role to ask that on a regular routine basis. It is the provider's role to know what supports we need on a daily basis, their preferences, but the DDDS social worker monthly asks, monthly, quarterly, asks the residents are you happy with your nurse. Are you happy with your BA. Are you happy with your day program, provider, where you are living. They are the ones that ask that question. So we routinely don't ask that, so I don't want to set ourselves up for that.

Male: This is Terry Olson, I worked with hundreds of staff and all of them knew what services each individual in their home received.

Female: Right.

Male: I mean that is just.

Female: Right. We know what services they receive.

Male: Supports are the key issue there I think?

Female: She is saying services.

Female: This is Melinda I think taking and out and putting in aware of would be different?

Male: Yeah.

Male: Terry Macy. The whole point that you are supporting someone with that knowledge.

Female: Right.

Female: Right.

Female: And how to make service?

Female: Okay. I have to call time. And we'll pick this up next week at this point. Number five.

Male: Oh, my gosh.

Female: We still have quite a bit to get through. So if you haven't read through the document and made your notes please do so before the next meeting so we can kind of moving it along if you have, you know, wording choices, bring those choices with you. Um so we'll continue this next week, continue to go through the document. Um, talk about the, um, the answer options, Kyle's e-mail, we have the page one general information to go through.

Female: Do you have any, any -- this is Laura, anything about the whole -- ah, (Indiscernible) slash -- the part for residents --

Female: Do you want --

Female: For next time. I wonder if it is available for next time.

Female: Do you want to e-mail us something so we can read it before the next meeting?

Female: Talking about the lease -- the lease requirement.

Male: If it goes to the AG's office, we know that ain't going to happen.

Female: That's more complicated.

Female: That is going to be -- that's fine. If we don't have to think about it, that's fine.

Male: This is Victor, is there also talk at CMS about providing additional information, more specificity about what is meant by heightened scrutiny?

Male: I don't think we, we -- I would not expect any more direction from -- CMS period.

Male: Any time soon.

Male: They are probably going to leave that up to the state.

Male: Yeah. The direction that I understand that's out there -- pretty significant right now is we're done.

Male: All right. I have been hear something rumblings maybe that is not the case. But I was looking to see if someone anybody else had more information.

Male: I'm sure everyone would appreciate more guidance.

Male: Yes.

Male: No question about that.

Female: Okay. So to wrap up for today, next week for the agenda we're going to continue to walk through the draft assessment. We're going to talk about the answer options, discuss Kyle's e-mail, discuss page one general information and instructions. We go through the action items, hopefully we will be able to close some of those once we get through the document. Or next meeting is next Thursday, same time and place. Does anything else they would like to bring up before we close the meeting.

Male: With all of that business, Libby. This is Victor. Will that be a six or seven hour meeting?

[Laughter]

Male: How far did we get today?

[Laughter]

Male: That would be six hours.

Female: How far did we get? Well, the other group extended the meeting an hour.

Male: Just saying.

Male: Brutal.

Female: I think we're spent after two hours, is what I've noticed. I don't know how far we got today. We got through quite a bit.

Female: (Speaker off microphone).

Female: Yeah.

Female: Okay. And most of the last couple pages has to do with the leases and stuff. So -- okay.

Thank you. That's a wrap.

[Event concluded]

"This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings."